REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least at paragraph [0022], and therefore not new matter has been added. No claims have been added or cancelled.

Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,477,646 to Krishna et al. ("Krishna") in view of US Patent Application No. 2003/0225991 by Calderon ("Calderon"). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites at least the following:

> the variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit sequentially receives a number of variable width cipher data packets each having an identical width and the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width, combines the number of sequentially input variable width cipher data packets received to generate a fixed width cipher data packet and outputs the fixed width cipher data packet

Krishna, and Calderon, taken separately or in combination, fail to suggest or disclose all of the above-recited features of amended independent claim 1. The current Office Action notes on page 3, item 4 that "Krishna does not explicitly disclose the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width, combines the number of sequentially input variable width cipher data packets received to generate a fixed width cipher data packet and outputs the fixed width cipher data packet."

However, the Office Action looks to modify Krishna with Calderon and asserts at page 3 that Calderon compensates for the deficiencies of Krishna at FIG. 7 and paragraph [0036]. Specifically, the Office Action asserts at page 6 that "Calderon discloses combining smaller variable length packets into a fixed size packets and the fixed sized packet is not processed until the sufficient number of smaller variable length packets are combined. Applicants respectfully

disagree that Calderon suggests or disclose all of the above-recited features for at least the following reasons.

As the Office Action notes, FIG. 7 and paragraph [0036] of Calderon illustrate and describe external memory partitions 710, 715, 720, 725, and 730 each storing, respectively, a fixed width data packet 740, 741, 742, 743, and 744, each of which has a length equal to the external memory partition size. Also describing FIG. 7, Calderon further states:

> External memory partition 745 stores packets 746, 747, and 748, all of which have lengths less than the external memory partition size. Packets 746-748 are grouped together and written to external memory partition 745 when an amount equal to the external memory partition size has been collected (par. [0036]).

The Office Action specifically relies on the above-cited text from Calderon in its rejection. However, in contrast with the above-claimed variable width packets, it can be seen in FIG. 7 that each of the packets 746, 747 and 748 has a different width. Thus, in Calderon, a fixed size packet cannot be divided by the variable length packet because the variable length packets are not the same size. Consequently, Calderon does not suggest "the variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit sequentially receives a number of variable width cipher data packets each having an identical width," as presently claimed above.

Further, the Office Action fails to specifically disclose if and where Calderon describes "a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width," as recited above. In fact, Calderon cannot suggest such a combination value because each of the variable width packets 746, 747 and 748 in Calderon has a different width. Consequently, in Calderon there is no single variable width value described that may be used to provide a single combination value as recited above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Krishna, and Calderon, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 7 and 13, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not suggested or disclosed by Krishna, and Calderon, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 7 and 13 also allowed.

Further, claims 2-6 and 8-12 and 13-18, variously depend from independent claims 1, 7 and 13, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 7 and 13, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Dependent claim 6 recites at least the following features:

> if the deciphering width data is generated, the deciphering width cipher data deciphering unit generates and outputs a deciphering completion signal;

Krishna and Calderon, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest or disclose, at least, all of the above-recited features.

The Office Action asserts at page 5, item 8 that Krishna describes the above-claimed features at col. 5, lines 12-37. However, the cited text fails to even mention a "deciphering completion signal," let alone all of the features recited in dependent claim 6. If the above rejection is to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request the Office provide a more specific rationale supporting the rejection, or specifically indicate if an assertion of inherency is being relied upon.

Absent further support for the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Krishna, and Calderon, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features are recited by dependent claim 12, with potentially differing scope and breadth, the rejection of claim 12 should also be withdrawn.

REQUEST FOR ENTRY IN ACCORDANCE WITH 37 CFR 1.116:

Entry of this Amendment in accordance with 37 CFR 1.116 is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not presented earlier because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues under appeal is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct. 31, 2007

By: 

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501